

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/670,157	SUNDARAM ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Aaron Strange	2153

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Aaron Strange. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) David Lee. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 17 February 2005.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 12-15.

Identification of prior art discussed: none.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Attachment.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

1. The proposed amendment received on 1/31/2004 was discussed.
2. Mr. Lee was informed that the proposed amendment would not place the claims in condition for allowance due to problems with claim 12. However, there appeared to be a misunderstanding with regard to the Examiner's recommendations in the advisory action of 12/30/2004, so an agreement to amend the application via Examiner's amendment was made.
3. The Examiner suggested that proposed claim 12 be amended to replace "wherein reordering further comprises....smaller than the range of possible values" with "wherein reordering further comprises imposing a window on the range of possible values of the rollover component that is smaller than the range of possible values of the rollover component of the received packet identifiers and reordering only the data the values of whose rollover component are within the window".
4. An agreement was reached to enter the suggested claim 12 along with the proposed claims 13-15 via Examiner's amendment.